

## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/622,003	07/16/2003	Li-Te Chin	16863-002001	1673
26181 75	90 05/20/2005		EXAMINER	
FISH & RICHARDSON P.C.			KIM, YUNSOO	
PO BOX 1022 MINNEAPOLI	S, MN 55440-1022		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
	•		1644	<del>-</del> .

DATE MAILED: 05/20/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/622,003	CHIN, LI-TE	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Yunsoo Kim	1644	
The MAILING DATE of this communication Period for Reply	appears on the cover sheet wi	th the correspondence address	_
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RETHE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CF after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory provided to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by some any reply received by the Office later than three months after the rearned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ON.  R 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a r.  a reply within the statutory minimum of thin eriod will apply and will expire SIX (6) MON tatute, cause the application to become AE	eply be timely filed  y (30) days will be considered timely.  THS from the mailing date of this communication.  ANDONED (35 U.S.C. & 133).	
Status			
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on _			
2a) ☐ This action is <b>FINAL</b> 2b) ☒	This action is non-final.		
3) Since this application is in condition for all closed in accordance with the practice und		·	
Disposition of Claims			
4) Claim(s) 1-35 is/are pending in the applica 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are with 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) 1-35 are subject to restriction and	ndrawn from consideration.		
Application Papers			
9) The specification is objected to by the Exar 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) Applicant may not request that any objection to Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the co	accepted or b) objected to the drawing(s) be held in abeyar rrection is required if the drawing	ce. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d)	
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for form  a) All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority docum  2. Certified copies of the priority docum  3. Copies of the certified copies of the application from the International But  * See the attached detailed Office action for a	nents have been received. nents have been received in A priority documents have been ireau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	pplication No received in this National Stage	
Attachment(s)	. 🗖		
<ol> <li>Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)</li> <li>Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948</li> <li>Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SE Paper No(s)/Mail Date</li> </ol>	) Paper No(s	ummary (PTO-413) )/Mail Date formal Patent Application (PTO-152) 	

Application/Control Number: 10/622,003 Page 2

Art Unit: 1644

## **DETAILED ACTION**

1. Claims 1-35 are pending.

2. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

I. Claims 1-14 and 25-35 drawn to a method of preparing fully human antibody classified in

class 435, subclass 69.6.

II. Claims 15-22 drawn to a fully human antibody classified in class 530, subclass 387.3.

III. Claims 23-24 drawn to a method for preventing or treating an HIV classified in class 424.

subclass 139.1.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

Inventions I and II are related as process of making and product made. The inventions are distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) that the process as claimed can be used to make other and materially different product or (2) that the product as claimed can be made by another and materially different process (MPEP § 806.05(f)). In the instant case fully human antibody can be prepared by phage display method.

Inventions I and III are related as process of making and process of using the product. The use as claimed cannot be practiced with a materially different product. Since the product is not allowable, restriction is proper between said method of making and method of using. The product claim will be examined along with the elected invention (MPEP § 806.05(i)). In the instant case, HIV may be treated by a method other than antibody (i.e. chemotherapy).

Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art as shown by their different classification, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

3. This application contains claims directed to the following patentably distinct species of the claimed invention of Group II. The distinct species are the identity of the sequence recognized by the

Art Unit: 1644

antigen. Applicant is required to elect a particular sequence as recited in claim 18. These species are distinct because they differ in structure.

Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. Currently, claims 15 and 16 are generic.

Applicant is advised that a reply to this requirement must include an identification of the species that is elected consonant with this requirement, and a listing of all claims readable thereon, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

- 4. Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include an election of the invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143).
- 5. The examiner has required restriction between product and process claims. Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and a product claim is subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be rejoined in accordance with the provisions of MPEP § 821.04. Process claims that depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the patentable product will be entered as a matter of right if the amendment is presented prior to final rejection or allowance, whichever is earlier. Amendments

Art Unit: 1644

submitted after final rejection are governed by 37 CFR 1.116; amendments submitted after allowance are governed by 37 CFR 1.312.

In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103, and 112. Until an elected product claim is found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product claims and process claims may be maintained. Withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with an allowed product claim will not be rejoined. See "Guidance on Treatment of Product and Process Claims in light of In re Ochiai, In re Brouwer and 35 U.S.C. § 103(b)," 1184 O.G. 86 (March 26, 1996).

Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, Applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during prosecution either to maintain dependency on the product claims or to otherwise include the limitations of the product claims. Failure to do so may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder. Further, note that the prohibition against double patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issues. See MPEP § 804.01.

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Yunsoo Kim whose telephone number is 571-272-3176. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F,9-5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Christina Chan can be reached on 571-272-0841. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Page 5

Yunsoo Kim

Patent Examiner

Technology Center 1600

April 27, 2005

Patrick J. Nolan, Ph.D.

Primary Examiner

Technology Center 1600